DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 775 IR 003 389

AUTHOR	Blase, Nancy G.
TITLE	SDILINE Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Library.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	36p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Computer Programs; Information Needs; *Information Retrieval; Information Services; *Library Services; Library Surveys; Medical Libraries; *Medical Research; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Researchers; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Current Awareness Service; Current Contents; SDI; *SDILINE; Selective Dissemination of Information; University of Washington Libraries

ABSTRACT

The University of Washington Libraries offers a monthly computerized retrieval of medical literature (MEDLINE) based on a profile of interest supplied by the user. To evaluate user response to the service 136 questionnaires were sent out; 119 were returned. Among the major findings of the survey were: SDILINE is of major value in alerting users to new articles in their field; SDILINE printout is closely scanned by most requestors; the time lag in SDILINE citations does not bother requestors; and most requestors felt that SDILINE complemented other similar services, such as "Current Contents." (JY)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122775

SDILINE Evaluation

Spring 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Nancy G. Blase
MEDLINE/Reference Librarian
Health Sciences Library
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

IR 003 389

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction i

References iv

List of Tables 1

APPENDIX A. Sample Questionnaire

APPENDIX B. Questionnaire with Totals/Percentages

APPENDIX I. SDILINE Returns from Teaching Faculty

APPENDIX II. SDILINE Returns from Graduate Students

APPENDIX III. SDILINE Returns from Researchers

APPENDIX IV. SDILINE Returns from Others

APPENDIX I through IV DELETED due to irreproducibility of original

INTRODUCTION

A questionnaire to evaluate user response to SDILINE, mentioned in a journal article by Wood and Seeds,[1] spurred this MEDLINE Analyst and Karen Ivy, MEDLINE Secretary, who runs the SDILINE searches each month, into sending out a similar evaluative document.

In February 1975 we decided which questions we wanted answered by our SDILINE users in order to cover their reactions to their SDILINE retrieval(s), the number of persons using their retrieval(s), what use(s) they make of SDILINE, how it has affected them, their other means of keeping up with the current literature, and their comparing Current Contents with SDILINE. The questions on finding current literature resulted from my reading Lancaster's study re the neurosciences.[2] In order to achieve a high response rate, one question asked if the user would be continuing his SDILINE(s) after June 1975, and the cover letter stated that that question had to be answered and returned in order to renew the SDILINE for the next fiscal year.

The cover letters and 136 questionnaires were sent out in March, with a return date three weeks hence. One questionnaire was sent for each SDILINE.

Eighty persons returned 119 questionnaires, for a response rate of eighty-eight per cent (88%) for the number of SDILINEs. (Among the twelve per cent not responding was an SDILINE requester who had returned to France

but had asked that his retrievals continue for the remainder of the fiscal year.)

The primary purpose in writing to the SDILINE users was to find out which retrievals were not satisfactory--in order that we could

(1) reformulate appropriate search strategies and/or

(2) explain the scope and search limitations of SDILINE.

One question designed to achieve this asked the user why he believed his printouts were unsatisfactory. There were forty-nine (49) returned questionnaires with some response to this, although some indicated that the results were, in fact, satisfactory. The next question asked the user how he wished to change his topic. In every case in which this and/or the previous question was answered, this MEDLINE Analyst telephoned or wrote to the user, either about altering the strategy (including explaining why it was not advisable to alter) or discussing SDILINE capabilities when the strategy could not be changed.

We analyzed most of the data, including totals and percentages, according to whether the users were teaching faculty, researchers, graduate students, or "other," according to our records.

The format of this SDILINE evaluation consists primarily of tables of figures, followed by some comments or annotations of possible significance. Appendix A is a copy of the questionnaire itself; Appendix B is a copy of the questionnaire with the numbers and percentages of responses given. Appendix I through Appendix IV consist of the raw data for each question, including a requester's code, department, and number of SDILINE requests.

A brief communication to compare our results with those of Wood and Seeds and of Lancaster is in preparation.

1. Wood, M. S., and Seeds, R. S. Development of SDI Services from a Manual Current Awareness Service to SDILINE. Bull. Med. Libr. Assoc. 62:374-384, Oct. 1974.

2. Lancaster, F. W. A Study of Current Awareness Publications in the Neurosciences. J. Documentation 30:255-272, Sept. 1974.

List of Tables

Table 1. Categories of Persons Responding . . . . . Page 2

Table 2. Number of Requests Per SDILINE Requester . . . . Page 3

Table 3. Departments Represented . . . . . Page 4

Table 4. Number of Persons Sharing Same SDILINE Retrieval . Page 14

Table 5. Uses Divided by Category of Requester . . . . . Page 15

Table 6. Scanning Habit Change by Category of Requester . Page 16

Table 7. Reading Change by Category of Requester . . . . . Page 17

Table 8. Awareness of New Literature by Category of Requester . . . . . Page 18

Table 9. Analysis of Combination of Answers on Results by Category of Requester . . . . . Page 20

Table 10. Means of Keeping up with Current Literature by Category of Requester . . . . . Page 21

Table 11. SDILINE vs. *Current Contents* by Category of Requester . . . . . Page 22

Table 1. Categories of Persons Responding

Category	Number	Percentage of Total
Teaching faculty	39	49
Researchers	13	16
Graduate students	16	20
Others	12	15
Total	80	100

Table 2. Number of Requests Per SDILINE Requester

Category of Requester \ Number of Requests	1	2	3	4	Totals
Faculty	23 (59%)	9 (23%)	4 (10%)	3 (8%)	39
Researchers	9 (69%)	4 (31%)			13
Graduate Students	14 (88%)	2 (12%)			16
Other	9 (75%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)		12
TOTALS	55 (69%)	17 (21%)	5 (6%)	3 (4%)	80

As would be expected, a high proportion of the multiple requests are from researchers and faculty.

Table 3. Departments Represented

(i.e., Number of Requesters Per Department)

BLASE

	Faculty	Researchers	Students	Others	Total
1. Anesthesiology	2	1			3
2. Biological Structure		1			1
3. C.D.M.R.C.		1		1	2
4. Chemical Engineering			1		1+
5. Clin. Res. Ctr. Harborview	1				1
6. Epidemiology		1			1
7. Fisheries			1		1
8. Health Sciences Library				1	1
9. Health Services	2	1	1		4*
10. Independent Ph.D.			1		1
11. Laboratory Medicine	2				2
12. M.C.S.A.				1	1
13. Medical Genetics	1	1			2
14. Medicine	2	1			3
15. Microbiology	1				1
16. Music	1		1		2+
17. Nephrology	2				2
18. Neurological Surgery	1				1
19. Neurology		1			1
20. Nursing	3	1	1		5*
21. Obstetrics/Gynecology	1			1	2
22. Office Res. in Med. Ed.			1	1	2
23. Ophthalmology	1				1
24. Orthopedics	2				2
25. Pathobiology		1			1
26. Pathology	2				2
27. Pediatrics	2				2
28. Periodontics				1	1
29. Pharmaceutical Sciences	2		1		3
30. Pharmacology			2		2
31. Pharmacy	2				2
32. Physical Therapy			1		1
33. Physicians					
Mason Clinic				2	2
Other				2	2
34. Physiology & Biophysics		1	1		2
35. Primate Center		1		1	2
36. Prog. Academic Planning				1	1
37. Prosthodontics	2				2
38. Psychiatry	4				4*
39. Psychology	1		2		3
40. Rehabilitation Medicine	1				1
41. Shadel Hospital		1			1
42. Speech	1				1
43. Student Affairs				1	1+
44. Zoology			1		1
	39	13	16	12	80

* = high number of requesters

+ = "unusual" department for biomedical database

Question 1

How useful is SDILINE in alerting you to new articles in your field of research?

119 replies

64 (54%) Major value

41 (34%) Moderate value

14 (12%) Minor value

0 (0%) No value

Comments:

1. It is good to know that no one considered it of no value.
2. Ten of the sixteen graduate students think SDILINE is of major value.
3. For people with two or more SDILINEs, each SDILINE could and did have different values.

Question 2

How closely do you scan your SDILINE printout?

121 replies

2	(2%)	Printout is only checked when time permits.
18	(15%)	Printout is briefly scanned.
101	(83%)	Printout is closely scanned.
0	(0%)	Printout is not checked.

Comments:

1. It did not seem worthwhile to analyze these figures by type of requester, since the scanning activity would tend to depend more on individual type of work habits rather than capacity in which each was acting.

Question 3

If an SDILINE citation is pertinent, do you always read the article?

119 replies

86 (72%) Yes

33 (28%) No

Comments:

1. Several people circled the "always." Perhaps the question should have been "usually read the article" or something less black-and-white than "always."
2. The no's seemed sprinkled evenly enough that an analysis by category of requester did not seem worthwhile. Again, it is probably a factor of individual habit.

Question 4

How closely do the articles in your monthly SDILINE describe your topic?

115 replies

20 (17%) Most are relevant.

63 (55%) Many are relevant.

32 (28%) Few are relevant.

0 (0%) No articles are relevant

Analysis of a Section

Categories of requestors stating they received few citations were:

Faculty	9 out of 39	(23%)
Graduate students	7 out of 16	(44%)
Other (category)	4 out of 12	(33%)
Researchers	4 out of 13	(30%)

Comments:

Perhaps the faculty tend to focus more on the subjects they want when they submit their requests.

Question 5

If your printouts are NOT satisfactory, what do you judge the problem(s) to be? [Multiple answers, if necessary]

49 replies

14 (29%) Too many of the articles are irrelevant and do not describe the topics which I requested; the search should be reformulated.

7 (14%) SDILINE does not adequately cover my research field.

2 (4%) My interests have changed, and I am now interested in new topics.

7 (14%) I receive too many articles and would like the topic narrowed.

6 (12%) I receive too few articles and wish to broaden the subject.

13 (27%) Other: [and added comments]

I like it to include some nonrelevant citations. It keeps me aware of neighboring fields.

Perhaps the answer is that I am not requesting the topics precisely enough.

I cannot describe my interests adequately to include the full range of desirable articles without also including a much larger number that are not of interest to me.

Satisfactory. I'm willing to scan titles of low relevance in order to be sure everything of interest is included.

Not many articles in the field. SDILINE is not to blame.

Perhaps I receive too many.

Many articles do not deal with adolescence, and that is the only age I am looking at.

Question 5 (continued)

Does not adequately cover my research field [thermal pollution].

Behind the time 2-6 months.

Don't know if articles aren't being found or if no new articles in field are currently being written.

Would like it confined to human subjects.

No problem--utility is fabulous.

High noise level related to indexing practices, a chronic problem since search cannot be refined and still provide all relevant articles.

Excellent.

Action Taken:

In all cases of a NOT satisfactory comment, I called the requester to suggest ways to alter the strategy. When I was unable to reach them by telephone, I wrote to them. In some cases the strategy could not be altered without risking the user's getting no citations almost every month; in most cases, however, it was changed to try to meet their needs.

Most comments showed the user understands the system's limitations.

Question 6

If you have indicated that you wish to change your topic(s) in any way, please indicate the change(s) here.

Combine the two searches into one.

Not at all.

Primarily concerned human data male infertility.

Would like to continue with topic for a little while longer.

Please discontinue my SDILINE request.

Expand to cover axonal transport as a topic.

Stimulate the authorship of more articles on this topic. (2)

Olfactory physiology in general (instead of just fish).

Auditory function of the hemispheres of the brain.

Articles should relate music to psychological and physical problems, etc.

Need consultation--Perhaps I should broaden the topics in hypertension.

Narrow scope.

Have not requested changes to now.

Psychiatric emergency. Hospitalization of psychiatric patients in general hospitals. Hospitalization of involuntary patients.

Some articles are not relevant.

I would like to have included nasogastric tube feeding and liquid diets.

Action Taken:

For each questionnaire where an actual change was requested or indicated, I called the requester and discussed the potential changes in his/her strategy. The formulations for their searches were then altered, when possible, to try to improve the retrieval for their needs.

Question 6 (continued)

Comments:

1. In most cases, the requesters who wished to change topics had also marked a NOT satisfactory comment.
2. The wording of the responses showed that most requesters understand the SDILINE system.

Question 7

The citations from SDILINE are three months (or more) out of date when they are sent to you. Does this in any way affect your use of the citations from SDILINE?

132 replies

0 (0%)	Citations are not current enough to be useful.
63 (48%)	I use SDILINE articles to pick up articles missed by other means of current awareness.
69 (52%)	Time lag does not affect usefulness.

Comments:

The final two choices are not really mutually exclusive; thus, the question is almost two questions and cannot be evaluated as one. One can learn from these figures that about fifty per cent (50%) use SDILINE to pick up articles missed by other current awareness means.

Question 8

My SDILINE is used by: [Indicate the number of persons, including yourself]

Table 4. Number of Persons Sharing Same SDILINE Retrieval

Number of Persons	Frequency	Total Number of Persons Using SDILINEs
1	39	39
1-2	2	2-4
1-3	1	1-3
2	26	52
2-3	2	4-6
3	14	52
3-5	1	3-5
4	1	4
5	1	5
6	3	18
6-8	1	6-8
8-10	1	8-10
10	15	150
15-20	1	15-20
20	2	40
500 (M.C.S.A. newsletter)	1	500
1600 (Current Primate References)	1	1600
		2460 39-56 or 2499-2516 (and not counting the two publications: 399-416)

Question 9

My SDILINE is used for: [Multiple answers, if necessary]

101 (39%) Research

53 (21%) Teaching

34 (13%) Patient care

58 (23%) Continuing education

10 (4%) Other (e.g., Preparing review articles; Program development; Review of literature bibliographies to provide up-to-date current bibliography; Tertiary bibliographic service; M.C.S.A. newsletter)

Table 5. Uses Divided by Category of Requester

Uses \ Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
Research	8 (19%)	8 (50%)	5 (38%)	2 (18%)
Research; Teaching	11 (26%)	1 (6%)	1 (8%)	1 (9%)
Research; Patient care				2 (18%)
Research; Teaching; C.E.	9 (21%)	1 (6%)	2 (17%)	
Research; Teaching; Patient care	3 (7%)			
Research; Teaching; Patient care; C.E.	7 (16%)	1 (6%)		1 (9%)
Research; C.E.	1 (2%)	3 (19%)	4 (31%)	
Research; Patient care; C.E.		1 (6%)		2 (18%)
Teaching; Patient care	2 (5%)			
Teaching; Patient care; C.E.	2 (5%)			
Teaching; C.E.		1 (6%)		
C.E.			1 (8%)	3 (27%)
TOTALS	43	16	13	11

Comments:

The division between "teaching faculty" and "researchers" is not clean, and the questionnaire did not ask them in which category they considered themselves. The various combinations of uses was interesting to me.

Question 10

As a result of reviewing SDILINE, do you scan fewer, more or the same number of journals?

114 replies [totals regardless of multiple requests from one requester]

29 (25%) Scan fewer journals

24 (21%) Scan more journals

61 (54%) Scan the same number

Comments:

In general, SDILINE has not changed the scanning habits of most of the requesters.

Table 6. Scanning Habit Change by Category of Requester

Scanning Habit Change \ Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
Scan fewer	11 (33%)	3 (20%)	3 (23%)	2 (18%)
Scan more	10 (30%)	3 (20%)	1 (8%)	Ø
Scan same number	12 (37%)	9 (60%)	9 (69%)	9 (82%)

Comments:

The faculty seem to predominate in the ratios for scanning fewer and scanning more. The "other" group has the largest majority of scanning the same number, followed by researchers and students. Again, this is probably habit by individual rather than in what category he falls.

Question 11

As a result of SDILINE, do you read fewer, more or the same number of articles?

115 replies [totals regardless of two from one person]

2 (2%) Read fewer articles

81 (70%) Read more articles

32 (28%) Read the same number of articles

Comments:

It's nice to know that a large percentage reads more articles!

Table 7. Reading Change by Category of Requester

Reading Change \ Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
Read fewer	1 (2%)			1 (9%)
Read more	32 (78%)	11 (69%)	6 (46%)	9 (82%)
Read same number	8 (20%)	4 (30%)	7 (54%)	1 (9%)
Can't tell		1 (1%)		
TOTALS	41	16	13	11

Comments:

Apparently, only the researchers maintain their habits (of reading the same number of articles). The other three groups all had more persons (relatively more, that is) who read more than they used to.

Question 12

Has SDILINE had an impact on your awareness of new scientific literature of direct concern to you? That is, as a result of SDILINE, would you say (with respect to new literature) you are much better informed; somewhat better informed; no better informed but certain of not missing anything of importance; not really affected?

117 replies

24 (21%) Much better informed

78 (67%) Somewhat better informed

13 (11%) No better informed but certain . . .

2 (2%) Not really affected

Table 8. Awareness of New Literature by Category of Requester

Awareness of New Literature \ Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
Much better informed	9 (21%)	3 (19%)	2 (17%)	2 (20%)
Somewhat better informed	29 (69%)	10 (63%)	8 (67%)	6 (60%)
No better informed but certain . .	4 (10%)	3 (19%)	1 (8%)	1 (10%)
Not really affected			1 (8%)	1 (10%)
TOTALS	32	16	12	10

And one researcher answered "spend less time to obtain same amount of information."

Comments:

The impact of SDILINE does not seem to vary significantly from group to group.

Question 13

Would you say that results of SDILINE: [Multiple answers, if necessary]

a. Prevented duplication of research conducted elsewhere.

b. Saved a significant amount of research time.

c. Significantly changed the direction or emphasis of a research project.

d. Contributed directly to patient care.

e. Led to consideration of a new viewpoint on a research project.

f. Suggested a different interpretation of research data.

194 replies

23 (12%)	a.	(prevented duplication)
64 (33%)	b.	(saved research time)
13 (7%)	c.	(changed direction/emphasis of research)
29 (15%)	d.	(contributed to patient care)
36 (19%)	e.	(new viewpoint in research project)
21 (11%)	f.	(suggested different interpretation)
7 (4%)		None of above or no answer
1 (1%)		Other

Comments:

About a third said it saved a significant amount of research time; almost one-fifth said it led to consideration of a new viewpoint on a research project.

Question 13 (continued)

"Results"

Table 9. Analysis of Combination of Answers on Results by Category of Requester

Results \ Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
a		1 (6%)		1 (7%)
a, b	3 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
a, b, c, d	1 (2%)			
a, b, c, d, e	1 (2%)	1 (6%)		
a, b, d, e, f	1 (2%)			
a, b, e	2 (4%)			
a, b, f	2 (4%)			
a, e	1 (2%)	1 (6%)		
a, e, f	1 (2%)			
a, f	1 (2%)			
b	12 (24%)	5 (30%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
b, c	2 (4%)			
b, c, d, e	1 (2%)			
b, d	4 (8%)	1 (6%)		3 (21%)
b, d, e	1 (2%)			
b, e	1 (2%)	3 (18%)	1 (7%)	
b, e, f	2 (4%)		2 (14%)	1 (7%)
b, f			1 (7%)	
c	2 (4%)			
c, e				1 (7%)
c, e, f	1 (2%)			
d	1 (2%)			1 (7%)
d, e	1 (2%)	1 (6%)		
d, f	1 (2%)			
e	2 (4%)	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	
e, f			2 (14%)	
f				
No answer given or none of the above	6 (12%)	2 (12%)	5 (36%)	5 (36%)
TOTALS	50	17	14	14

Comments:

The combinations of results especially by type of requester is interesting.

Question 14

Do you have any other means of keeping up with the current literature? [Multiple answers, if necessary]

157 replies

85 (54%) Personally scan specific group of journals.

15 (10%) Have research assistant/technician scan journals for me.

38 (24%) Personally use Current Contents.

6 (4%) Have research assistant/technician scan Current Contents.

13 (8%) Other

Table 10. Means of Keeping up with Current Literature by Category of Requester

Means of keeping up with current literature / Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
Personally scan journals	28 (50%)	9 (45%)	11 (60%)	9 (50%)
Have another person scan journals	3 (6%)	1 (5%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)
Personally use Current Contents	16 (29%)	4 (20%)	4 (22%)	2 (11%)
Have another person can CC	2 (4%)	1 (5%)		
Other:				
Jrl. Club in Div. Nephrology	1 (2%)			
Scan IM; PA	1 (2%)			
ASCATOPICS	1 (2%)	1 (5%)		
Toxicity Bibliography; EM	1 (2%)			
Dental Abstracts		1 (5%)		
Current Primate References			1 (6%)	
Clipping service			1 (6%)	
Scan reference journals (BA, CA, EM)				1 (6%)
CLASS and ASCA				1 (6%)
Staff scans EM				1 (6%)
No Answer	3 (6%)	3 (15%)		1 (6%)
TOTALS	56	20	18	18

Question 14 (continued)

"Other Means of Keeping Up"

Comments:

Between forty-five per cent (45%) and sixty-one per cent (61%) of the SDILINE requesters personally scan journals, while eleven per cent (11%) to thirty per cent (30%) personally use Current Contents.

If you use Current Contents, how do SDILINE and Current Contents compare in overall usefulness?

47 replies

6 (13%) SDILINE covers my topic better than Current Contents.

10 (21%) Current Contents covers my topic better than SDILINE.

31 (66%) Current Contents and SDILINE complement each other.

Table 11. SDILINE vs. *Current Contents* by Category of Requester

Comparison \ Category of Requester	Faculty	Students	Researchers	Other
SDILINE better than CC	3 (16%)		1 (17%)	1 (25%)
CC better than SDILINE	2 (11%)	1 (20%)	3 (50%)	3 (75%)
Complement each other	13 (72%)	4 (80%)	2 (33%)	
TOTALS	18	5	6	4

Annotation:

Only thirty-three persons answered this question. About half believe that SDILINE and Current Contents complement each other. A few other answers were to the effect that the SDILINE requester had never used CC and would look into it.

Question 15

Will you be continuing SDILINE after June 1975? (Current subscription runs through June 1975.)

121 replies

83 (69%)	Yes
1 (1%)	Probably
1 (1%)	If receive funds
19 (16%)	Only if rates stay the same
5 (4%)	Not sure
12 (10%)	No

Number of persons who did continue--as of 16 July 1975:

	Yes	No	No Answer
Faculty	22	7	10
Students	4	8	4
Researchers	7	5	1
Other	4	6	2
TOTALS	37 (46%)	26 (33%)	17 (21%)

Comments:

It is not surprising that students would cancel their SDILINEs, since most of them are probably finishing their theses or research.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION OF SDILINE

Requester's Name _____

Name of Search _____

1. How useful is SDILINE in alerting you to new articles in your field of research?

   _____ Major Value
   _____ Moderate Value
   _____ Minor Value
   _____ No Value

2. How closely do you scan your SDILINE printout?

   _____ Printout is only checked when time permits.
   _____ Printout is briefly scanned.
   _____ Printout is closely scanned.
   _____ Printout is not checked.

3. If an SDILINE citation is pertinent, do you always read the article?

   Yes _____ No _____

4. How closely do the articles in your monthly SDILINE describe your topics?

   _____ Most are relevant.
   _____ Many are relevant.
   _____ Few are relevant.
   _____ No articles are relevant.

5. If your printouts are NOT satisfactory, what do you judge the problem(s) to be? [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

   _____ Too many of the articles are irrelevant and do not describe the topics which I requested; the search should be reformulated.
   _____ SDILINE does not adequately cover my research field.
   _____ My interests have changed, and I am now interested in new topics.
   _____ I receive too many articles and would like the topic narrowed.
   _____ I receive too few articles and wish to broaden the subject.
   _____ Other (specify):

APPENDIX A

6. If you have indicated that you wish to change your topics in any way, please indicate the changes here.

7. The citations from SDILINE are three months (or more) out of date when they are sent to you. Does this in any way affect your use of the citations from SDILINE?

_____ Citations are not current enough to be useful.
_____ I use SDILINE articles to pick up articles missed by other means of current awareness.
_____ Time lag does not affect usefulness.

8. My SDILINE is used by:

_____ (Indicate number of persons, including yourself.)

9. I use SDILINE for: [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

_____ Research _____ Teaching _____ Patient Care
_____ Continuing Education _____ Other (specify)

10. As a result of reviewing SDILINE, do you

_____ scan fewer journals.
_____ scan more journals.
_____ scan the same number of journals.

11. As a result of SDILINE, do you

_____ read fewer articles.
_____ read more articles.
_____ read the same number of articles.

12. Has SDILINE had an impact on your awareness of new scientific literature of direct concern to you. That is, as a result of SDILINE, would you say (with respect to new literature) you are

_____ much better informed.
_____ somewhat better informed.
_____ no better informed but certain of not missing anything of importance.
_____ not really affected.

13. Would you say that results of SDILINE: [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

_____ Prevented duplication of research conducted elsewhere.
_____ Saved a significant amount of research time.
_____ Significantly changed the direction or emphasis of a research project.
_____ Contributed directly to patient care.
_____ Led to consideration of a new viewpoint on a research project.
_____ Suggested a different interpretation of research data.

14. Do you have any other means of keeping up with the current literature? [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

_____ Personally scan specific group of journals.
_____ Have research assistant/technician scan journals for me.
_____ Personally use Current Contents.
_____ Have research assistant/technician scan Current Contents.
_____ Other (specify)

If you use Current Contents, how do SDILINE and Current Contents compare in overall usefulness?

_____ SDILINE covers my topic better than Current Contents.
_____ Current Contents covers my topic better than SDILINE.
_____ Current Contents and SDILINE complement each other.

IMPORTANT:
15. Will you be continuing SDILINE after June 1975? (Current subscriptions run through June 1975.)

_____. Yes _____ No _____ Only if rates stay the same

February 1975

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF SDILINE

(Percentages in parentheses rounded to nearest whole number.)

Requester's Name _____

Name of Search _____

1. How useful is SDILINE in alerting you to new articles in your field of research?

64(54%)	Major Value	14(12%)	Minor Value	
41(34%)	Moderate Value	0	No Value	Total=119

2. How closely do you scan your SDILINE printout?

2(2%)	Printout is only checked when time permits.	
18(15%)	Printout is briefly scanned.	
101(83%)	Printout is closely scanned.	Total=121
0	Printout is not checked.	

3. If an SDILINE citation is pertinent, do you always read the article?

Yes 86(17%) No 33(28%) Total=119

4. How closely do the articles in your monthly SDILINE describe your topics?

20(17%)	Most are relevant.	32(28%)	Few are relevant.	Total=115
63(55%)	Many are relevant.	0	No articles are relevant.	

5. If your printouts are NOT satisfactory, what do you judge the problem(s) to be? [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

14(29%)	Too many of the articles are irrelevant and do not describe the topics which I requested; the search should be reformulated.
7(14%)	SDILINE does not adequately cover my research field.
2(4%)	My interests have changed, and I am now interested in new topics.
7(14%)	I receive too many articles and would like the topic narrowed.
6(12%)	I receive too few articles and wish to broaden the subject.
13(27%)	Other (specify):

Total=49 (41%)

6. If you have indicated that you wish to change your topics in any way, please indicate the changes here.

7. The citations from SDILINE are three months (or more) out of date when they are sent to you. Does this in any way affect your use of the citations from SDILINE?

0	Citations are not current enough to be useful.	Total=132
63(48%)	I use SDILINE articles to pick up articles missed by other means of current awareness.	
69(52%)	Time lag does not affect usefulness.	

8. My SDILINE is used by:

1-1600 (Indicate number of persons, including yourself.)

9. I use SDILINE for: [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

101(39%)	Research	53(21%)	Teaching	34(13%)	Patient Care	Total=256
58(23%)	Continuing Education			10(4%)	Other (specify)	

10. As a result of reviewing SDILINE, do you

29(25%)	scan fewer journals.	Total=114
24(24%)	scan more journals.	
61(54%)	scan the same number of journals.	

11. As a result of SDILINE, do you

2(2%)	read fewer articles.	Total=115
81(70%)	read more articles.	
32(28%)	read the same number of articles.	

12. Has SDILINE had an impact on your awareness of new scientific literature of direct concern to you. That is, as a result of SDILINE, would you say (with respect to new literature) you are

24(21%)	much better informed.	Total=117
78(67%)	somewhat better informed.	
13(11%)	no better informed but certain of not missing anything of importance.	
2(2%)	not really affected.	

13. Would you say that results of SDILINE: [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

23(12%) Prevented duplication of research conducted elsewhere.
64(33%) Saved a significant amount of research time.
13(7%) Significantly changed the direction or emphasis of a research project. Total=193
29(15%) Contributed directly to patient care.
36(19%) Led to consideration of a new viewpoint on a research project.
21(11%) Suggested a different interpretation of research data.
7(4%) None of the above. 1(1%) Other

14. Do you have any other means of keeping up with the current literature? [Multiple answers, if necessary.]

85(54%) Personally scan specific group of journals.
15(10%) Have research assistant/technician scan journals for me.
38(24%) Personally use Current Contents. Total=157
6(4%) Have research assistant/technician scan Current Contents.
13(8%) Other (specify)

If you use Current Contents, how do SDILINE and Current Contents compare in overall usefulness?

6(13%) SDILINE covers my topic better than Current Contents.
10(21%) Current Contents covers my topic better than SDILINE. Total=47
31(66%) Current Contents and SDILINE complement each other.

IMPORTANT:

15. Will you be continuing SDILINE after June 1975? (Current subscriptions run through June 1975.)

83(69%) Yes 12(10%) No 19(16%) Only if rates stay the same Total=121
1(1%) If receive funds 5(4%) Not sure
1(1%) Probably

February 1975